



Paper No. 10

JOHN S. BEULICK
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102

COPY MAILED

NOV 07 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

ON PETITION

In re Application of
Holmes et al.
Application No. 09/742,545
Filed: December 22, 2000
Attorney Docket No. 9D-HR-19396

This decision concerns the October 22, 2002 renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The renewed petition is **DISMISSED**.

As stated in the October 4, 2002 decision, the February 4, 2002 §1.137(b) petition was dismissed, in that, some of the substitute drawings submitted with that petition did not comply with the margins requirements of 37 CFR 1.84.

Some of the substitute drawings filed with the instant renewed petition again fail to meet the §1.84 margins requirements. The renewed petition is thus dismissed.

Applicants may file a renewed §1.137(b) petition (no fee) that is:

- accompanied by:
 - necessary substitute drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84;¹ and
 - a **statement** that the entire delay in filing the required drawings from the due date until the filing of a grantable §1.137(b) petition was unintentional;
- filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mailing date of this decision unless proper extension(s) of time is (are) obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a);²

and addressed (**by mail or by hand**) to:
Commissioner for Patents, USPTO
Office of Petitions
Crystal Plaza Four, Suite CP4-3C23
2201 South Clark Place
Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone inquiries may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 308-0763.

RC Tang
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions
Office of the Commissioner
for Patents

Attachment: 11/6/02 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (courtesy copy)

¹ Only the sheets of drawings objected to by the draftsperson need to be re-submitted.

² 37 CFR 1.137(e)(1).